



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## RECONSTRUCTION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

### GENERAL POLICY

The reinstatement of the returning soldier into the industrial and social life of the country after the war is a problem of immediate and pressing importance. The nation has put forward an organized effort to enrol the citizens in the ranks of the fighting force, and there must be an equally organized effort to secure their return to civil life. Plans to provide for the returning soldiers must be made now. Other belligerent nations are squarely facing the problem and are making extensive and far-reaching preparations to meet it. The welfare of the soldiers and the welfare of the nation demand the immediate initiation of organized public assistance that will facilitate the quick reabsorption of the military forces into the industrial life of the country.

Underlying any scheme of providing for the returning soldiers is the sense of our obligation to them, but there is also an economic side to the problem. If, for example, 500,000 men remain unnecessarily idle for only one week, the loss represented by their wage-earning capacity will amount to from ten to twelve million dollars. If a large number of men are allowed to drift into the ranks of unskilled labor in either town or country or diverted by ill-considered legislation to enterprises which will not provide them with profitable employment or congenial environment, the material and social consequences may be very serious.

Every war has been followed by a period of readjustment. In the past there was no strain in the readjustment because our enormous public domain offered opportunities for hundreds of thousands of men who could not be absorbed in industrial communities. The soldiers of Washington moved westward to the fertile Ohio valleys. After the Civil War the rich lands and other resources of the West were opened up and for many years took care of our surplus population. It is different now. The free agricultural lands on which a man can make an independent living with his own labor are practically exhausted. The frontier has passed away.

A century ago Lord Macaulay wrote regarding America: "The test of your democracy will come after the exhaustion of your free lands." We are going through this test now. What new reservoirs of labor opportunity are there available in this country to absorb the energies of the men who will return to industry after the war? The men who fought under Roberts in South Africa did not return to England to "cut the Colonel's lawn" but sought new opportunities in the colonies. No more will the men who fought for democracy under Pershing in France be contented with less than the opportunity to achieve full economic independence.

The country can no longer afford the luxury of discharging its obligation toward the soldiers by bestowing upon them public lands without any further thought as it has done in the past, for the surplus capital of good lands in public ownership has been used up, and the remaining lands can only be developed with public help. The tillable land now remaining of the originally vast domain is scattered and of doubtful agricultural value or is desert or semi-desert land capable of agricultural development only under an expensive system of irrigation. The rest is grazing land and timbered areas of which only a small proportion can be cultivated when cleared. The effort to place settlers on land where failure is certain is a vicious policy from the standpoint of national economics; it breeds poverty, degradation, and discontent on the part of the settlers and does not promote permanent and prosperous communities. The time has come to abandon the policy of placing people carelessly on poor land and to substitute by proper organization and careful planning the development of the millions of acres of good land now idle and to secure permanent homes, continuous production, and sound social and industrial conditions.

Unless economically sound, no special legislation or measures in favor of the returning soldier will prove of benefit to him or the country. In so far as forced and artificial methods of settlement are uneconomical and injurious to settlers, just so far will they prove injurious to the returned soldiers even if schemes are liberally subsidized with government money. Only by striking at the root of the problem in connection with land settlement will the returned soldier, and with him the whole country, be benefited.

Settlement on land should not, however, be the only opportunity for the returning soldier. Our soldiers are citizens. Citizens before the war, they will be equally citizens when they return. They have learned and followed their various callings. They are of all classes, trades, and professions. Many of them will return with a wider outlook and a heightened ambition. They will have learned discipline and self-reliance; they will have seen the advantages of co-operation and social intercourse.

Ambitious upon their return, they will demand opportunity for regular employment and for improved conditions both in the workshop and the home. The greatest and economically the soundest reward, therefore, which the public can offer to the returning soldier will be to increase the opportunities for profitable and regular employment, whether on land or in any other field to which his skill can be best adapted, to provide openings for the small man to make a success on land, to develop the natural resources in such a way as will support contented and permanent communities, and to improve the living conditions in the industries. Let the reward be in the form of a real chance to work and develop his ambitions, not a mere bounty that may be quickly spent.

The problem of the returning soldier is largely the problem of our economic and agricultural reconstruction after the war. Some phases of the problem, such as, for instance, the need for a change in our land settlement practice and in the conduct of such basic industries as the lumber industry, were pressing for a solution even before the war; the crisis has merely accentuated the need for remedies for social and economic evils from which we as a nation have been suffering. The provision for the returning soldier and sailor is in the direct line of social and economic betterment of the large masses of our people. Constructive statesmanship is needed if our young men are to be retained in the rural districts and serious industrial unrest averted in the cities.

The opportunities which the nation can offer to the returned soldier for profitable and regular employment are these:

1. Opportunity for settling on the land.
2. Employment in the development of the natural resources, such as forests, mines, water-power, oil fields, etc.

3. Combined urban and rural occupation.
4. Reserve employment. Construction of public works for improving country life, such as railroads, roads, rural building construction, draining swamp lands, reclamation of arid lands, etc.

#### THE RETURNING SOLDIER AND LAND SETTLEMENT

It is most fitting that those men who have answered the call of their country should be encouraged and assisted to find occupation on the land for which they have fought, provided such conditions can be insured as will offer them a reasonable prospect of success. Aside from our obligation to the soldiers, it is to the interest of the nation as a whole to attract a large part of the population to the land. One of the most important lessons learned from the war is the extent to which the defensive power of a country is strengthened by its capacity to produce food for its inhabitants. For some time our population has been growing faster than our food supply. We are not approaching starvation, but we are approaching the time when we must pay more attention to our land resources. Before the war we were producing 7 barrels of wheat per capita instead of the 9 barrels of 1880, and about 49 barrels of cereals, all counted, in place of 54, a decrease of some 10 per cent. In other words, we were producing a smaller surplus than several decades ago. Increasing the rural population is also desirable on social grounds. The stability and physical strength of a nation depend largely on those classes which have either been born and brought up in the country or have had the chance of country life. It is certain that the physique of those members of our nation who live in crowded streets rapidly deteriorates and would deteriorate still further if they were not to some extent reinforced by men from the country districts.

*Free land alone not enough.*—In looking for opportunities for land settlement one naturally turns to the public domain. There remains little public land susceptible of farming by individual effort as was the case in the rich areas of the Mississippi and other valleys of the West. Nearly all the tillable land remaining in public ownership will need public assistance to secure actual and permanent settlement, through large irrigation or drainage enterprises,

or in assistance in clearing forest land or other improvements, and in establishing community undertakings.

The results of the efforts to settle poor and unfit lands under the Homestead and Desert Land Act are written in the tragic failures of thousands of pioneers who wasted their efforts, lost their hopes, and became impoverished and embittered.

Even on land reclaimed by the government the number of homesteaders who fail is exceedingly great. On one of the government western reclamation projects 580 out of 898 settlers have given up and gone away. Such a condition appears to be the rule rather than the exception. Many settlers on government projects find themselves unable to meet their instalments.

The effort to push settlement to scattered tracts in mountain or other semiarid regions where the bulk of the land is not tillable has been a failure, except where the other resources have furnished an opportunity for employment during a part of the year. In forest regions scattered tracts have been cultivated and made the basis for homes as long as the timber lasted. When this was cut the land was abandoned. In the national forests many scattered tracts are successful through the protected use of the grazing in the forests; others through employment in connection with the timber, mining, and other industries. Where the settlement is in advance of the development of other resources it is largely a failure and will not succeed until the forest industries are placed on a permanent basis. This is well illustrated by the scattered areas of agricultural land eliminated from the national forests and thrown open to settlement. Thus on the west side of the Trinity National Forest in California 348 homesteads have been taken up. Of these, 252, or 72 per cent, have already been abandoned, and on 96, or 28 per cent, the settlers are leading a precarious existence. On the Florida National Forest there have been 496 entries obtained under various agricultural and other laws representing a total area of 74,371 acres. A census taken during the season of 1914 showed only 900 acres to be under actual cultivation upon these claims, or an average of 1.8 acres per claim for the entire number of claims.

The remoteness of the homestead, the high cost of clearing and preparing the land, the adversity of climate or soil, the difficulty

of obtaining cheap credit, together with the isolation and hardships of a pioneer life and inability to make a living from the land until it has been at least partially improved, all tend to make success under such conditions an extreme exception.

How many of our returning soldiers will be willing to go on land it is difficult to say. The Australian Commonwealth has distributed cards among soldiers in camp, at home, and abroad, on which they were invited to state their wishes as to their future occupation upon the termination of the war. Forty thousand soldiers expressed a desire to go upon the land. On the other hand, according to the Parliamentary Committee on the Care of Returned Soldiers in Canada, only a very small percentage of the 12,000 returned men so far handled by the Commission were willing to go on the land. Out of 346 soldiers who had returned to Alberta only six signified a willingness to take up farming, although a number of the returned men had been farmers before they enlisted.

The number of men attracted to the land will depend on the conditions of settlement offered to them. To force land settlement by soldiers who do not want to become farmers will be undesirable both for the soldiers and for the country. Our first duty to all prospective settlers, including the returning soldiers, is to make farming more profitable. Giving free farms to soldiers without any previously thought-out plans will only aggravate the land-settlement problem and enlarge the field of speculation.

*Settlement through private agencies will not meet the situation.*—For many years agricultural settlement on privately owned lands has been aggressively promoted by land-colonizing companies and railroads. In spite of their efforts, progress in permanent settlement has not been satisfactory. The speculative, high cost of land which in many cases could not produce, even when improved, enough to pay the interest on its purchase value, the necessity of clearing and improving it at great expense before a living could be made from it, and the lack of cheap credit prevented many settlers from meeting their first instalments, blasted their hopes of independent life on the land, and forced them back to the city. Privately owned lands have risen rapidly and continuously in price. On the average, farming lands of the United States sell for nearly

three times as much as they did in the opening year of the century. In 1900 the average price was \$15 per acre; in 1915 it was estimated by the United States Department of Agriculture at more than \$45 an acre. This increase in cost of land is accompanied by a corresponding increase in the cost of equipment and expense of operation.

As a result in the most fertile sections of the country there are scores of counties with fewer people now than they had ten years ago. Thousands of acres of land which were once occupied are now deserted and the present system of land settlement is productive of much poverty and degradation. In many of the newer rural districts of America there is less social progress than in some of the older European countries. The movement of labor into the cities goes on. The high cost of living has a close relation to the narrowing opportunities on the farm. Professor Elwood Mead, a careful student of the land problem in this country and abroad, characterizes our land situation in the following words:

Only a small fraction of the public lands was transferred directly to cultivators. Nearly three-fourths was sold to speculators or granted to corporations and states which in turn sold mainly to speculators. The results have been a costly, wasteful, migratory settlement. The nation has been exploited rather than developed. Great landed estates have been created and ruinously inflated land prices now prevail.

The consequences of this careless, short-sighted, unsocial policy are coming home to roost. We are beginning to realize that the fortunes made in land speculation come mainly from the pockets of the poor; that our land policy is not creating an economic democracy but the reverse.

*Principles essential to successful settlement.*—Rural community development is at the root of a country's progress. Denmark, in the ten years before the beginning of the war, has practically doubled its agricultural population; from 27.1 per cent it increased it to 48.2 per cent. Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and France, and recently the state of California, have inaugurated a plan of rural development in which the land is bought in large accessible areas, subdivided into farms and either turned over to the settlers on a perpetual lease or sold, with certain restrictions as to its resale, on long-term payments. The buyers are aided in improving and cultivating these farms by a competent organization adequately



financed by the government. They are given the benefit of expert advice, not only in their agricultural operations, but in buying and selling organizations. In other words these countries are developing communities in a systematic way, while in this country generally we turn over to the homesteader 160 acres in the wilderness or leave him to the mercy of the land agent to work out his destiny single-handed as if he were a Robinson Crusoe.

Canada, England, Australia, and New Zealand are making provisions to take care of the soldiers on land by extending the present practice. Australia has appropriated about \$300,000,000 for closer settlement for the benefit of the returning soldier.

The Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, after considering the question of unemployment and of the returning soldier, came to the conclusion that the present system of homesteading was useless as a solution of the problem of the returning soldier owing to the prospective settler having insufficient capital and experience. It recommended "that the government should select land for the proper carrying out of a scheme and be requested to offer, as an option to discharge from the army, further enlistment for a period of five years of such men as would be willing to undertake agricultural work under the direction of qualified experts from experimental farms and agricultural colleges; that such men received the regular army pay and allowances with rations on the same basis, suitable accommodation to be provided with quarters for married men and families. After such period of enlistment has expired the men who have thus served should have the option of settlement upon suitable-sized allotments of the land so improved, the same to be held on lease-hold terms from the Dominion Government." The Ontario Commission on Unemployment, after discussing the problem of the returning soldier, unanimously voted in favor of the above-mentioned recommendation.

Compared with the present homestead policy, the offering of employment on the land at good wages and in a good dwelling in a well-populated area would unquestionably be a better means of getting returned soldiers back to the land. To accomplish this, however, it is first necessary to provide both access to the land and attractive housing conditions in rural districts. The problem of

placing returned soldiers on land does not differ in any material sense from that of placing any other class of settlers on land. Any system of land settlement which is sound for one class is, generally speaking, sound for another class, and its soundness should first be determined irrespective of any class. The land settlement should in no way be forced but should be permitted to proceed naturally after the right conditions of land development are laid down by the government.

The principles which have now come to be considered as essential to the success of any land-settlement plans are these:

1. Purely agricultural settlement should be developed only on fertile land susceptible of ready improvement and within practical access to markets. The publicly aided settlement should by no means be confined to the public lands but should be extended to the purchase of private lands, as in Australia.

2. The land should be placed at the disposal of the settlers either under a form of perpetual lease, subject to transfer under certain conditions, or under a freehold with restrictions as to resale and transfer. In either case the form of tenure should aim to accomplish two things: (*a*) security to the settler in the permanent use of the land for himself and family; (*b*) prevention of speculation of any kind in the right to use the land.

3. If necessary, the land should be cleared, drained, or reclaimed, and made cultivatable before settlers are allowed on it.

4. Any scheme of land settlement by the government should be on the colony system, as only under such a system will it be possible to provide the expert guidance and business organization essential to the success of the enterprise.

5. The government should provide the settler with cheap credit on long-term payments so as to make it possible for the man of limited means to secure the improved land without carrying the burden of high interest and being harassed by constant fear of losing his place by reason of failure to meet large payments or of inability to renew a bank loan.

6. No man should be allowed to take up a farm unless he has the necessary experience and is otherwise qualified for work and life in the country.

7. A man who has had no previous experience in farming or is not sure of his adaptability to life on a farm should be given an opportunity to learn the farming business on a small unit leased to him by the government and under practical direction.

8. No one should be allowed to own more than one farm or land equivalent in value to that taken up under this plan.

9. Only the actual resident tiller of the land can be the owner of the farm.

10. Special consideration should be given to the wives of the settlers by providing, through women's institutes or clubs, facilities for improving the conditions of home life and raising the standard of living and by providing the means of social recreation and giving the women a greater interest in country pursuits.

11. Organization should be provided for collective marketing of the produce as well as for the purchase of implements, seed, and other equipment, either on a co-operative basis or through a business manager working on a commission basis.

12. Provision should be made for the best expert advice and instruction for the settlers.

13. Comfortable houses with all necessary sanitary improvements should be erected for the settlers before they go on the land. These improvements are to be paid for by the settlers in long-term payments on the amortization plan.

14. Comfortable dwellings should be erected for the small renters who are leasing small units of land from the government, learning farming, or working out as laborers on the farm.

15. Provision should be made to make country life as attractive as possible, with facilities for recreation, for churches, and schools.

If our returning soldiers are to be attracted to the land and given the opportunity to make good on it, public direction of rural development along the lines suggested is essential. Agricultural settlement on such a plan is no longer an experiment; it has been a financial and economic success in the thickly populated countries of Europe and in the sparsely populated districts of Australia, New Zealand, and now also in California. It has lifted hundreds of European peasants and farm laborers into a broader and more

generous life and has been an active educational influence in showing private enterprise how to carry on successfully similar colonizing undertakings. As a result of the experience gained from the operation of the Reclamation Act, Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, stated last year before the House Committee on Irrigation:

If I had the installation of the Reclamation Service today I would follow out this scheme as to every acre of land, government and private, on our projects. I would say: "The Government will put in the dam; it will put in the main canal; it will level the land; it will seed the land," and then I would divide that land up, and would not allow anybody to go on it except the man who was capable of using it.

#### THE RETURNING SOLDIER AND THE NATURAL RESOURCES

The right development of our vast natural resources offers another field of opportunity to the returning soldier. In the past the use of our natural resources has failed even more than land settlement to develop permanent and contented communities. The mining camp, the lumber camp, and the construction camp, with their shifting population, are typical of the transitory character of the industries themselves. There is no more familiar sight in the region of our greatest development of natural resources than the "blanket stiff" going from camp to camp seeking a better job. The opportunities of the future, both for the returning soldier and for the people who live in the regions where there are great natural resources awaiting development, lie in the establishment of permanent industries and permanent communities. In mining operations, permanent communities providing healthful living conditions could be established because the life of the mines extends, as a rule, over a long number of years. This is particularly true where mining is carried on in the neighborhood of agricultural lands. In the case of the forest, which is a renewable resource, it is perfectly feasible to create healthy and permanent towns if the lumber industry itself is stabilized.

The lumber industry as it is at present constituted offers small opportunity for permanent and contented communities. It has passed over this country from ocean to ocean in a series of waves.

It originated in Maine, moved to Michigan in the seventies, completed its highest development in the Lake states in the nineties, and is now flourishing in the Southeast. There it will be exhausted in a few decades and will then center on the Pacific Coast. As a rule it has not left permanent communities in its wake, unless the land was exceptionally suited to agriculture. The industry has been, and still is, conducted as a type of mining. A valley or logging unit is worked out; then the operation shifts to another location. In this way one valley after another has been cleared of timber and left empty and desolate. One region after another has been depleted of its forest stock.

Timber mining, being essentially migratory, breeds migratory tramp labor. Since the lumberjack must live in a camp and the man with a family is excluded as a worker, the lumber industry is an industry of homeless men. The conditions which are produced by the present methods of timber mining are well summarized in the report of the President's Mediation Commission:

The forests and lumber mills of the Pacific Northwest have a predominant war importance. The raw materials they furnish are indispensable to the execution of the aircraft and shipping programs of the government. The entire industry employs about 70,000 men. The labor conditions in the lumber industry have their reflex upon all industry in that territory.

Social conditions have been allowed to grow up full of danger to the country. It is in these unhealthy social conditions that we find the explanation for the unrest long gathering force but now sharply brought to our attention by its disastrous effect upon war industries.

Partly the rough pioneer character of the industry, but largely the failure to create a healthy social environment, has resulted in the migratory, drifting character of the workers. Ninety per cent of those in the camps are described by one of the wisest students of the problem, not too inaccurately, as "womanless, voteless, and jobless." The fact is that about 90 per cent of them are unmarried. Their work is most intermittent, the annual labor turnover reaching the extraordinary figure of over 600 per cent. There has been a failure to make these camps communities. It is not to be wondered, then, that in too many of these workers the instinct of workmanship is impaired. They are—or rather have been made—disintegrating forces in society.

The Commission found that the life of the average camp did not exceed three and one-half years. With migratory forest industry it is financially impossible to construct residences for workers

because the annual depreciation charges of 25 per cent or more would be far beyond the ability of the worker to pay from wages. On a \$1,600 home the annual charge would be \$400 for depreciation, and average of about \$50 for interest and perhaps \$50 for maintenance, a total of \$500 per annum. This means a monthly rental charge of between \$40 and \$50, which is far beyond the reach of the unskilled worker as he is now paid. With the continuous operation extending 25 years or more, depreciation on such a residence would be reduced to about \$64 per annum, and since maintenance and interest would not be much affected, the annual charges would be only \$164, or less than \$14 per month.

These unsatisfactory conditions in the industry can be rectified by transforming it from an industry which uses the forest as a mine to one which treats it as a renewable resource. Such a transformation is difficult on private lands. A few private owners may be found now ready to change their method of handling their timber resources and thus provide opportunities for permanent communities. As a rule, however, such a transformation will not take place without the people first securing control of the large timber holdings. For the purpose of providing for the returning soldier we must therefore look to the national forests. These afford immediately opportunities for creating permanent forest communities in connection with logging operations on them. Assuming that only two-thirds of the forest area within the national forests, or 100 million acres, is actually forest-bearing land, this area, when fully developed could, at a conservative estimate, support a permanent population of 300,000 families, allowing each family \$800 a year in wages, or about 1,200,000 persons in all.

The management of forest resources on a permanent basis is even less of an experiment than rural development with government aid. In Europe sustained production of the forests forms the backbone of an economic system of small holdings, especially when dealing with poor agricultural land. In Switzerland a forest of 10,000 acres with an adjoining area of 3,000 acres of agricultural land supports a prosperous permanent community of 1,500 people. About 81 per cent of all the workmen employed in the woods and

mills in Europe are small holders of land within or adjacent to the forest. The parishes of La Teste and Caseaux in the southwestern part of France in the Landes, which have been reforested for the last sixty years, contained before reforestation a population of 1,600 people. Since the forests were established these parishes support a population of 14,000.

There are now about 12,000 lumberjacks composing the tenth and twentieth Forest Regiments. There must be also a large number of lumbermen in the general draft furnished by the lumber industry. These men, when they return to civil life, will naturally look for work in the woods and, having learned in France the benefits derived from the stability of the forest industry, will expect similar practice here.

The task of organizing our national forests into small units on a strictly continuous yield basis is not as difficult as it may seem and is not beyond the strength of the existing organization in the Forest Service. It does not mean tackling the regulation of 100,000,000 acres of forest at once, but organizing here an area and there an area as the ever-widening circles of economic life come into contact with them. Intensive forest surveys are ahead of, rather than behind, present needs. The objection that the national forests do not always control sufficiently large units for sustained management should not present an insurmountable obstacle because co-operation of the public and private owners in the management of natural producing units can be secured in most cases on a basis satisfactory to both. The further objection that the lumber industry is overdeveloped and it would be economically unsound for the government to undertake the construction of new sawmills is not valid. The overdevelopment of the lumber industry does not prevent the constant appearance of new sawmills, often operating in government timber. In many cases government control of private logging operations on the national forests would be all that would be needed, the government merely providing ahead a series of cuttings within definite periods and locations, and enforcing measures essential to the maintenance of permanent communities. The logging and milling operations can be carried out as at present under timber-sales contracts.

Lumber companies which operate on a large scale naturally are interested especially in the distant national or even international markets and, as a rule, pay little attention to the local needs. That this policy works to the disadvantage of local development is shown by the experience of many co-operative agricultural organizations, fruit- and orange-growing associations, etc., which, although surrounded by public and private forests, find it difficult to secure box material for packing purposes except at very high prices. The government would be able to ameliorate this condition.

The railroads of the country now under government control are using in the neighborhood of six billion feet annually. Our army and navy also use large quantities of wood. Much of this demand could be supplied from the national forests. If the public forests can satisfy the government needs efficiently and economically, and at the same time broaden the opportunities of the people and provide conditions for permanent forest communities, it would be contrary to the national interests if they were not used for that purpose. Such use will merely serve as an illustration of how the forests in private hands can also be handled so as to widen, instead of gradually to narrow, the opportunities of labor in the industry.

The basis for each forest community would be the area within whose radius an annual cut may be permanently maintained. A sawmill suitably located within the area and continuously supplied with timber from the growth on land tributary to it would form the basis of a sawmill community which could remain permanently in one location. The logging camps which may have to change from time to time would still form a part of the entire forest community organization. The lumberjacks who are now in France engaged in logging and milling operations on government and private forests would be admirably fitted for similar logging operations on the national forests. Possibly a great deal of the logging equipment which is the property of the United States government may be available upon the termination of the war for this purpose.

The shortage of pulp and paper in this country and the presence of a large supply of pulp timber available on the national forests opens another way for meeting the unemployment problem. The



pulp industry, more than the sawmill town, provides opportunities for creating large village communities with healthful social life.

The utilization of the immense water powers on the public domain, and particularly on the national forests, possess wonderful possibilities for creating new towns and rural industries, such, for instance, as the pulp and paper industry and the electrification of large stretches of the publicly controlled railroads. The same is true with regard to the mining resources on the public domain, particularly in Alaska.

#### ORGANIZING COMBINED URBAN AND RURAL SETTLEMENT

The plan of housing workers engaged in the war industries as provided for now by the government could be made to serve also the needs of the returned soldier. Within the last few years there has been a tendency to decentralize manufacturing industries from large cities to suburbs. Some of the industries, particularly the United States Steel Corporation, have erected in this way practically new towns, for instance at Gary, Indiana, and in the suburbs of Duluth, Minnesota. The corporation usually acquires a site in a rural territory within easy reach of some large center, and on this site erects new mills and a town for the accommodation of its workers, as well as for the population likely to be attracted to supply the social needs of the new town. In England the movement on the part of manufacturers who emigrate from crowded centers to rural districts has been going on for over thirty years. Many large works formerly located in London and other large cities have been moved out of that territory and industrial villages created to accommodate the workers.

The creation of new settlements by industrial corporations or near single industry towns has serious drawbacks. It leads either to too much control over the lives of the workers by the corporation or leaves the workers at the mercy of their own ignorance and of speculators in real estate. If, however, this movement could be stimulated and organized by the government, states, or municipalities, and housing conditions provided for the working men, a combination of urban and rural life could be secured. Such settlements, established with the aid of the government or state, in which

the head of each family could have a small patch of land, a house, and the choice of several industries in which he might find employment, would go a long way toward providing an opportunity for greater independence and more healthful living conditions for the returned soldier as well as the civilian worker. They might also relieve the congested conditions in our big cities.

In New Zealand there is a village settlement system by which workers can acquire small holdings varying from 1 to 100 acres on which to erect their homes near their work. In South American states settlement under government control and assisted by government organization has met with some success. The general land law of Argentina (1903) provides for the founding of colonies and towns and also provides that land shall be surveyed, classified, and planned, and that the government executive "shall reserve such tracts as may be found appropriate for the founding of towns and the establishing of agricultural and pastoral colonies." The government of Brazil recognizes the importance of selecting land with a view to securing its full economic use and the health of the settlers. Colonies are established on the most fertile lands, with facilities for water supply and means of communication, and occupying "an economical location." In 1914 the Brazilian Board of Immigration and Colonization had established twenty such colonies, which are reported to be very satisfactory.

This movement has taken a particularly strong hold in England and to some degree also in Canada in the form of the garden-city movement. It has the advantage of avoiding the evils incidental to single industrial towns and of providing the intermingling of both urban and rural life. This plan of development has been in operation in England since 1903 and has made substantial progress. The principal points in the scheme are these:

1. A large agricultural tract is purchased on which an industrial and residential town is established by securing a concerted movement of manufacturers from crowded centers.
2. A restricted area is set apart for urban development and the greater part of the tract is retained permanently for agricultural purposes.

3. The entire area is developed in accordance with a definite plan to secure convenience, efficiency, and healthy living conditions. The dividends of the shareholders are limited to 5 per cent per annum and the rest of the profits is used for the benefit of the town and its inhabitants.

The best example of such a garden city is the city of Letchworth, within 33 miles of London. When the property was bought it had a population of approximately 450 people, all engaged in agriculture, and with no railway station on the property. The average rental considered fair to farmers and sufficient to provide a satisfactory return to the Garden City Company is about \$7.50 per acre per annum for land and buildings and \$5 per annum for land without buildings. The population now numbers about 13,000 and there is a splendid new station in the center of the town. No more than twelve houses are permitted to be erected on any one acre and the average is approximately about half that number. When the town is complete the population will number about 35,000. The city will not be permitted to expand beyond the area delimited for urban development. Therefore there will be no separation of the urban and rural parts of the scheme, which affords an example of a kind which is unique in the world. The garden city movement in England has attracted the attention of all the European countries and of the United States and has caused influential bodies to advocate the establishment of similar communities in these countries. Senator Sheppard, in 1917, introduced the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The garden city and garden suburb movement in Europe has made wonderful progress during the first eight years of its existence; and

WHEREAS, The object of this movement is to secure permanent and comfortable homes for the people on terms within the reach of the average income, and to combine the advantages of town and country in the same community; and

WHEREAS, This movement is contributing materially to the health, comfort, and prosperity of the people who have experienced its benefits, and

WHEREAS, The movement, in the estimation of many, points the way to the long-sought goal of a contented, home-owning population; and

WHEREAS, Thousands of American citizens have petitioned members of Congress for an investigation of the movement both in Europe and in the United States; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be authorized and requested to hear and consider such testimony as may be produced before said committee in Washington regarding this movement both in Europe, in the United States, and elsewhere, and to report its findings to the Senate.

The movement, therefore, may be expected to become a subject of inquiry by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The garden-city movement points the way to the soundest kind of scheme that could be developed for the purpose of dealing with the problem of the returned soldier. The establishment of new town systems or garden cities where there are good facilities for profitable production and distribution, where intensive farming can be successfully carried on, and where advantage can be taken of the tendency to remove industries from crowded centers to rural districts or to establish new industries near sources of water-power and raw materials, when organized by state or government aid but without too many restrictions, offers one of the most fruitful fields for taking care of the returned soldier.

#### RESERVE EMPLOYMENT

In spite of all the efforts which may be made to reinstate our returned soldiers into civil life and readjust our economic life to peace conditions, it is reasonable to assume that difficulty will be found and delays occasioned. Unless there is a national organization to provide work for the discharged soldiers, sailors, and munition workers, there will be serious unemployment with its accompanying depression of wages and suffering. This can be averted by gradual demobilization and by undertaking needed public works, such as the reclamation, drainage, and preparation of the land for settlement, the building of houses for rural and urban settlement, improvement and extension of the railroads and canals, which will be at least for nearly two years after the war under government control, and of highways. There are a large number of railroad and highway engineer troops now in France; many of the engineer troops are trained in the construction of buildings. These troops upon their return would be particularly well qualified for community improvement work. Employment on these public works

may serve at the same time to prepare the man for a permanent occupation in the several fields of activity opened by the works. The plan suggested by the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada for giving the discharged soldier the option of enlisting for a period of five years to undertake agricultural work under qualified experts, and the further option upon the expiration of the five years of settling on the land thus improved, may offer a solution for emergency employment and apprenticeship as a stepping-stone to later independent life on the farm.

#### THE NEED FOR EARLY ACTION

Plans and preparations for taking care of the returned soldier should be made at once to meet the needs which will arise as demobilization proceeds. The first few months after men are discharged from the forces or after the work in munition factories and other war industries ceases will be the critical time. Unless the discharged soldiers and workers obtain regular work without delay there is danger that they may drift into the ranks of casual labor, thus making an orderly readjustment after the war so much more difficult. It is essential, therefore, that arrangements be made beforehand so as to have the opportunities available as soon as the war terminates. The moral effect of such measures upon the men, whether in the ranks of the fighting forces now in France or in the munition factories, should also be considered. If the men know that the country is thinking of them and is making plans for creating opportunities for broader life upon their return, their task will become easier and their enthusiasm greater.

It is essential, however, that the discharged soldier and worker shall not get the impression that the life, either on land or in other fields of activity under any government scheme, will be an easy one or that his financial rewards will be large. He should feel, however, that if he is prepared to work hard and make full use of the assistance given to him there is no reason why he should not make a reasonably good living and enjoy the benefits that come from a life in a community.

RAPHAEL ZON

WASHINGTON, D.C.